DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 103 CE 001 543

AUTHOR Humphrey, F. Charles
TITLE A Study of Adults' Preferences for Control of Molar Learning Activities.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference (Chicago, Illinois, April 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Characteristics; *Adult Education; *Adult Learning; Course Content; Educational Research; *Learning Experience; *Learning Motivation; Participant Characteristics; Student Characteristics

ABSTRACT

A research design was created to investigate if adults participating in noncredit courses have different preferences for control of inclass learning activities. Only the variables of "reason for participation" and "type of content" were researched as to whether they affected preference for control. The study provides evidence that different adults do have different attitudes toward control of molar learning in noncredit courses. The research design's reliability, validity, and the data analysis procedures are explained. Appendixes include the course ratings and the questionnaire forms. (JC)

ED 094103

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A STUDY OF ADULTS' PREFERENCES FOR CONTROL OF MOLAR LEARNING ACTIVITIES*

Results of several research studies showed that people have different preferences for control of learning experiences. However, few studies had been done to determine whether adult learners in organized learning experiences have different preferences for control of in-class learning activities. Nor had there been any study to see if these differential preferences were related to factors such as the type of content or the learners' reasons for participation. This study investigated whether adults participating in noncredit courses sponsored by University of Wisconsin-Extension had significantly different preferences for control of learning activities and whether the two variables (1) reasons for participation and (2) type of content were related to these differences.

The following questions were basic to the solution of the general problem:

1. Did adults participating in noncredit courses, sponsored by University of Wisconsin-Extension, have differences in their preferences for control of course learning activities?
2. Were their reasons for participation related to their preferences for control?
3. Was the type of content of the learning experiences related to their preferences for control?

Study Delimitations

This study had both conceptual and design delimitations. Conceptually, its purpose was not to study the effect of preference for control

*Paper presented by F. Charles Humphrey at the Adult Education Research Conference, April 18, 19, 1974, Chicago, Illinois.

CE001543

on actual learning. Preference for control of molar behaviors was studied with only published course descriptions as the bases for judgment, not any special instructions from the researcher or the various course instructors.

Only the variables of "reasons for participation" and "type of content" were researched as to whether they affected preference for control. Findings from previous research did not support researching such variables as age, sex, education, or income level. Only adults participating in noncredit courses were studied, and thus any findings can only be generalized to that kind of a group. Also there is only limited opportunity for learner control in a formal group method learning experience, and thus inferences made about preferences for control must keep this in mind.

Theoretical Framework

The Deweyian theory of epistemic curiousity[1] underlies differences among adults in their preference for control of learning activities. Some adults are more curious than others. Some have more strongly established self-concepts than others and tend to set their standards and expectations for learning based more on their own identity than on the expectations of a teacher. These individual standards cause them to establish individual goals when they participate in educational activities. Since they have their own goals, they want to go directly to the subject matter and decide what they want to learn and how they wish to learn it. In short, they want to control their learning rather than having it controlled by a teacher. This theory of the differential psychology of adult learning has been studied by Boyd,[2] who feels that there is research evidence to support it.

Apps[3] has theorized that the content of the learning experiences influences the way they should be organized. He believes that the focus of some learning activity is on acquiring content, while in other learning

situations the focus in on problem solving or personal growth by both learners and educators.' Apps suggests that learners might increase their learning and shorten the time to learn it by increasing their control over the learning experiences. Following the Apps' logic, it is conceivable that learners would prefer to have greater control over "issues" content courses than "skill acquisition" content courses.

The activities occurring during a learning experience have been described by Boyd[4] as molar behaviors. These molar behaviors are cyclic, similar to thinking:

1. Direction Setting: The setting up within the lesson structure, the direction that the learning group plans to take and the goals or aims that they wish to reach or accomplish during the specific lesson period.
2. Assessing: The process of establishing whether the students and the situation are prepared for the teaching-learning process to continue.
3. Planning: This behavior deals with very specific types of things that must be accomplished to make the learning experience successful, that is, "What do we have to do to get the job done!"
4. Gathering: The collecting of resources, information and equipment to carry out the plans of the planning step.
5. Applying: The integration of the first four steps into an actual learning experience.
6. Evaluation: This step seeks to put a value on the other five steps, particularly direction setting.

> It provides evidence to judge whether the lesson goals have been accomplished, thus providing input for reorganized direction setting for subsequent lessons.

Although Boyd describes these molar activities in the context of an individual learning experience, they could be operating at several levels in the organizing of learning experiences. They could represent the mental processes of an instructor as he plans a prospective course. They could represent the activities of a learning group as they make decisions about the conduct of an actual learning experience. Or, they could represent the experiences of an individual learner as he participates in a course long series of learning experiences.

In this study, the six molar activities were considered to be the processes operating during a series of course long learning experiences. The six molar activities served as the basis for operationalizing the dependent variable in this study, "perference for control." Preference for control was assumed to have the attributes of an attitude, thus making it capable of being measured.

Houle[5] found that adults are motivated to attend educational activities for essentially three reasons: (1) to accomplish specific goals, (2) to learn for the sake of learning, and (3) to engage in learning as a social activity. These three reasons have been consistent across all subjects studied, irrespective of any demographic characteristics. Although recent research by Burgess[6] and Grabowski[7] showed that the reasons could be factored into seven categories, Krietlow[8] believes that the three Houle orientations underlie them. Using Krietlow's rationale, I logically

combined the seven Burgess reasons into the original three Houle categories as follows:

1. Goal Orientation: Desire to reach a personal goal. Desire to reach a social goal. Desire to reach a religious goal. Desire to comply with formal requirements.

2. Social Orientation: Desire to take part in a social activity. Desire to escape.

3. Learning Orientation: Desire to know.

The three Houle orientations, consisting of the recombined Burgess factors, made up the "reasons for participation" variable in this study.

Sources of Data

Adults participating in noncredit courses during the spring semester of 1973 were selected as the study subjects. Ten noncredit courses were selected for the study, five with "skill" content and five with "issue" content. Four criteria were used to dichotomize the courses as "issues" or "skills". The criteria were:

1. Classification: Based on the course description in the Madison Area Programs catalog, they were classified as being either skill acquisition or discussion of issues.

2. Purpose: Using the Apps[9] framework for purposes of learning experiences, the courses' purposes were judged as being either (a) content transfer, (b) problem solving, or (c) personal growth.

3. Objectives: The objectives of the courses, as stated in the catalog description, were judged either (a) behavioral or (b) nonbehavioral.

4. Domain of Objectives: The objectives were further judged as being primarily in the (a) cognitive, (b) affective, or (c) psychomotor domain.

I used these four criteria because collectively they would provide evidence for dichotomizing the courses into the two types of content: issues and skills. The first criterion is self-explanatory. Additionally, all of the issues courses were listed under the heading Contemporary Issues and Problems in the Madison Area Programs Spring catalog. I employed the second criterion using the logic that the primary purpose of skills courses would be content transfer; the primary purpose of issues courses problem solving or personal growth. The logic in using the third and fourth criteria was that skills courses should have more behaviorally defined objectives than issues courses. Conversely, the objectives of the skills courses should be in either the cognitive or psychomotor domain and issues courses objectives primarily in the affective or cognitive domain.

A course evaluation form was constructed in the form of a matrix of the course titles and the four criteria (Appendix A). The 10 courses and 2 alternates were then rated against the 4 criteria. A panel of 10 judges, consisting of graduate students and faculty who had completed courses in Extension program planning or curriculum planning, were asked to rate the 12 courses on the same form. They were asked to assume that they had only the course descriptions (which were excerpted from the catalog and attached to the rating form) on which to base their ratings.

Eight of the 10 judges completed the form.

Appendix A shows my rating of the 12 courses along with a summary of the ratings of the 8 judges. There was almost unanimous agreement with my classification of the 12 courses. Agreement on the primary purpose of each course was not as unanimous. The judges tended to rate the course purposes as being problem solving or content transfer. However, several of the judges remarked on the form that these three purposes could be argued semantically in that the ultimate purpose of all adult learning is personal growth.

As mentioned earlier, these criteria were considered collectively in judging whether the courses were correctly categorized as being issues or skills. Although the judges' ratings for the course purposes were contradictory, their overall ratings of the four criteria served to reinforce my dichotomizing of each course.

Instructors of the courses selected were contacted in person two weeks before the first class session to explain the purpose of the research and type of cooperation desired. All 12 instructors said I could ask the students to participate in the study. However, data were collected on only five skills courses and three issues courses. No data were collected from the course "House-plant Management and Propagation" because it was an alternate skills course. Three issues courses, "Computers: Their Impact on Society," "Military Institutions and Military Men," and "Schools, Values, and Morals," were cancelled before the first session because not enough people enrolled. Data were collected from two of the chosen five issues courses and the alternate, "The Changing Roles of Women in Asia, Africa, and Australia." In all, 147 subjects participated in the study.

Data-Gathering Procedures

Constructing the Instruments

A composite data collection instrument consisting of two parts was constructed. First, it determined the subjects' reasons for participation so they could be categorized into one of the Houle learning orientations. Second, it measured their perference for control of the molar activities.

The total instrument is shown in Appendix B. Studies by Burgess, Sheffield, and Houle were the key guides in developing the "reasons for participation" instrument. The "preference for control" part of the instrument developed out of some exploratory work Forest[10] and I did as part of an end of course evaluation for a course in Extension program planning in 1971. Students were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with several statements about control of course activities such as outside readings, meeting times, evaluation of performance, and required written work. Because of the high internal consistency of these statements, it was postulated that an instrument could be constructed that would validly and reliably measure students' attitudes toward control of certain course activities.

Since the body of attitude statements about "preference for control" had been developed by Forest in 1971 using Likert scales, and had been tested for reliability, it was decided to build the "preference for control" portion of the data collection instrument around that nucleus. Using the original 12 Forest statements as a nucleus, 36 statements were written about the 6 molar behaviors described earlier. Five-point rating scales were used to measure the amount of agreement or disagreement with

each statement. The total scale ratings for all 36 statements constituted a subject's "preference for control" on a minimum-maximum scale.

Statements developed and validated by Burgess in 1971 served as the bases for operationalizing the "reasons for participation" portion of the data collection instrument. It was a recently developed technique for determining why adults participated in educational activities and Burgess had achieved a high level of realiability and validity with it. After recombining the 7 Burgess factors into the 3 Houle categories, 36 statements were selected, 12 from each of the 3 recombined Houle factors. Priority was given to statements with the highest factor loadings in each category. A five-point rating scale was similarly used with each statement to measure the amount of influence it had on one's participation. Each category had a minimum rating value of 12 and a maximum rating value of 60 so that each participant received a score value on each of the three learning orientations. The largest score value of the three became his or her "learning orientation".

Pretesting

The final composite instrument, consisted of 30 "reasons for participation" statements and 20 "preference for control" statements. These are the steps that led to its development:

1. A pool of "reasons for participation" and "preference for control" statements were developed according to the procedures specified in the previous two sections of this chapter. Since the reasons for participation statements had already been validated by Burgess, they were used in their original form. About one-half of the preference for control statements were negative and one-half positive.

2. A draft of the composite instrument was given to 10 judges (fellow graduate students) asking them to complete it and critique it in terms of overall format acceptability, clarity of the statements, and time required for completion. They were requested to make specific changes in any of the "preference for control" statements they felt were ambiguously worded and add any statements they felt related to molar learning activities.
3. The judges' reactions were summarized and recommendations incorporated into a revised instrument for further pretesting. The "reasons for participation" statements were scrambled using a random numbers table (Pestman and Schafer). The negative-positive "preference for control" statements were alternated. The instrument was also professionally edited for errors in punctuation, style, and format before pretesting.
4. The instrument was formally pretested with 14 adults attending a course called "Preparing Volunteers to Teach" at the Fox Valley campus, University of Wisconsin. Participants were University of Wisconsin-Extension faculty taking the course for both credit and noncredit.
5. Pretest responses were coded and analyzed using an item-analysis computer program available through the Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory. This test package provided information about which statements showed a spread in type of responses and which statements correlated with total responses to each of the three Houle orientations and to the "preference for control" statements.

6. Based on the item-analysis results, the instrument was reduced to 30 "reasons for participation" statements (10 for each Houle orientation) and 20 "preference for control" statements. The criteria for selection of statements were their discriminating ability as measured by spread of responses and their degree of positive correlation to the overall responses. The final rating values were 10 (10/x/1) to 50 (10/x/5) for each Houle orientation and 20 (20/x/1) to 100 (20/x/5) for the "preference for control" statements.
7. The final 50-item composite instrument was checked by a professional editor for punctuation, format, and reading level of instructions and statements before being administered to the 8 Madison noncredit course groups.

Reliability and Validity of the Instruments

The ITEMPACK[11] computer program was used to measure the reliability of the data-gathering instruments. ITEMPACK uses Item Analysis[12] as the statistical technique to provide a measure of reliability about a total score, composed of several statement scores, along with detailed information about each of the statement scores. It was developed specifically for use with Likert-type rating scales.

ITEMPACK uses Cronbach's alpha as its measure of internal consistency. Alpha is an estimate of the correlation between two random samples of items from the universe of items in a data collection instrument. It is a special case of the Kuder-Richardson coefficient of equivalence and is the mean of all split-half coefficients resulting from the different splittings of a test. Cronbach's alpha is superior to the conventional split-half or test-retest approaches for measuring internal

consistency because it provides a measure of all possible split-half coefficients for a given test.

The ITEMPACK test was performed on both the pretest data and the study data. Table 5 gives the coefficient of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) for the three Houle orientations and the "preference for control" scales.

Table 5. Coefficients of Internal Consistency for Data Collection Instruments.

Scale	Pretest*	Actual**
Learning	.90	.87
Goal	.88	.86
Social	.71	.82
Preference for control	.65	.76

*N=14
**N=147

The reliability of the instruments approached or exceeded .80, an acceptable level for making inferences about individual scores. The increase in the reliability coefficient for the "preference for control" instrument from pretest to actual data collection is attributable to discarding almost half of the pool of statements used in the pretest. The discarded items all had item-to-total correlations of .20 or less. Since the "reasons for participation" statements were all taken from the Burgess instrument, I anticipated that their reliability would be high; this expectation was confirmed.

Construct validity is relevant when the tester accepts no existing measure as a criterion of the quality being observed. The question is, then: How good was the construct validity of the "preference for control" instrument? Based on the pretest data, it appeared to be quite high; that is, the instrument did show that the pretest students had different levels of preference for control. The ultimate test of the construct validity of this instrument would be to observe the behaviors of the subjects during the actual learning experiences to see how much control they exerted over the molar activities. However, that was not a purpose of this study, and thus the "ultimate proof" was not obtainable here.

The "preference for control" instrument also had good content validity in that its statements were developed out of those used by Forest in the end-of-course evaluation. The 20 statements in the final data collection instrument were selected from a universe of 36 statements - a recommended procedure for achieving high content validity.

The instruments were administered at the first session of each course before any interaction between the instructors and students about course molar activities.

Data Analysis Procedures

Two different statistical procedures were used to test the hypotheses in the study - the Pearson goodness of fit chi-square test and the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks.

The first hypothesis was tested by dividing the "preference for control" scores into six categories, similar to the points on the Likert scales. The theoretical distribution of scores for the six categories was determined by dividing the total number of subjects by the number of categories.

The mean and standard deviations were computed for the "preference for control" scores using STATJOB, a standard "descriptive statistics" computer program used by Wisconsin Survey Research Laboratory personnel. The raw scores were converted to Z scores on the basis of the computed mean and standard deviation and the goodness of fit chi-square test performed in the usual manner.

Hypotheses 2 and 3 were tested using the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance by ranks. The decision to use this involved several considerations. Since the "preference for control" instrument was still in a developmental stage, questions could be raised about its relative reliability and its power to identify discrete levels in preference for control of molar activities. The alternatives were (1) the one-way ANOVA that assumes discrete scores, (2) the chi-square test of association that lumps the scores into nominal categories thus wasting whatever discreteness there is in the data, and (3) the Kurskal-Wallis test that can be used when some doubt exists about the size of difference between interval scores, but when the scores can be ranked from the lowest to the highest and groupings of scores tested for significance in their association with nominal groups.

Findings

Null Hypothesis 1 predicted that adults participating in noncredit courses would have no significant differences in their preferences for control of molar learning activities. The participants' scores did not significantly differ from a "normal" distribution and the first hypothesis was rejected.

The second null hypothesis predicted that the differences in preference for control of molar learning activities would not be related to the learners' reasons for participation. It could not be rejected

at the .10 level of significance.

The third null hypothesis predicted that the differences in preference for control of molar learning activities would not be related to the type of content of the learning experiences. This hypothesis was rejected at the .025 level for the association between preference for control and "type of content" (issues versus skills). It was additionally rejected at the .001 level for the association between preference for control and the specific content of each of 8 course groups.

The index of mean square contingency for "type of content versus preference for control" was .17, and .374 for "content group versus preference for control."

The issues content group showed a higher preference for control of molar learning activities than did the skills content group. Additionally, the order of preference for control of molar learning activities by each content group (from lowest to highest) was:

1. Wall Street and the Small Investor.
2. Family Estate and Financial Planning.
3. Changing Roles of Women in Asia, Africa, and Australia.
4. Wisconsin's Weather.
5. Interpersonal Communication - Everybody's Lifeline.
6. Private Enterprise in the United States.
7. Photographic Fundamentals.
8. Developing an Understanding of the Black Experience in America.

Five of the six molar learning activities were investigated post-hoc by relating certain attitude statements to each acitivity. There was an acceptable intercorrelation between "planning," "evaluation,"

"direction setting," "applying," and "gathering," as well as an acceptable correlation between the total scores for each of these activities and the scores on the overall preference for control instrument.

The data showed a trend toward higher preference for control of "direction setting" than other molar activities, with "evaluation" and "gathering" ranking second, and "planning" ranking the lowest. The issues content group tended toward higher preference for control of each of the five molar activities than the skills content group. It was further found that "direction setting" ranked the highest in all but one content group - "Changing Roles of Women in Asia, Africa, and Australia."

The issue course "Developing an Understanding of the Black Experience in America" had consistently higher preference for control of the five molar learning activities than any of the other groups.

Although it is difficult to draw any inferences from the relationship between "reasons for participation" and "preference for control," it appears that the learning oriented participants had slightly higher preferences for control of each of the five molar activities than the goal oriented learners. The learning-oriented group preferred the greatest control over "evaluation" and the goal-oriented group wanted the highest preference for control of "applying." Both groups expressed the lowest preference for control of "planning."

Implications of Study

This study provides evidence that different adults do have different attitudes toward control of molar learning activities in noncredit courses. It also shows that they have more positive attitudes toward control of courses with issues-type content than courses with skills-type content.

They seem to prefer the most control over the "direction setting" activity in learning experiences and the least control over "planning."

The implications of these findings are analogous to the procedures used by a medical doctor who, after performing certain tests on a patient, makes a diagnosis of that patient's problem and prescribes a cure for the problem. By using the "preference for control" instrument developed in this study, an adult educator could learn more about the learners who will be in his course - he could add it to a case history on each learner.

This case history would be composed of the usual demographic data such as age, sex, and amount of formal education, as well as information about the learner's knowledge level relative to a given content area. It would also consist of some information about an adult's learning needs: Why does he want to learn the proposed course content? What specifically does he want to learn from the universe of material being presented by the instructor? How does he want to learn it? How much control does he want over the course molar learning activities?

Thus, rather than making a diagnosis of the probable learning needs of the learning group the adult educator-doctor is diagnosing the learning needs of each learner in the group and organizing the learning experiences on the bases of these individual diagnoses.

Another important implication is that the learners prefer greater control over molar activities in courses like the black experience in America than they do over courses like interpersonal communication. Adult educators should consider that this basic difference in the type of content of the learning experiences they're organizing definitely influences the amount of control learners prefer to have over the course molar activities.

This study did not reveal a statistically significant relationship between adults' reasons for participation in noncredit courses and their

preference for control of the molar learning activities in those courses. This seems to imply that adults' motives do not have to be considered when making organizing decisions about the content and process of adult learning experiences. However, I believe the traditional procedure of categorizing participants into a learning orientation based on their scores toward a set number of statements may be an inadequate procedure for finding out their reasons for participating in an educational activity.

APPENDIX A

Table 1. Ratings of courses selected for use in study.*

Course	Criteria									
	Classification		Purpose			Objectives		Domain of Objectives		
	Skill	Issue	Problem Solving	Content Transfer	Pers. Growth	Behavioral	Non-Behav.	Cog.	Aff.	Psycho.
Photographic Fundamentals	X (3)		(2)	X (6)		X (5)	(3)	X (6)		(2)
Computers: Their Impact on Society	(1)	X (7)	(2)	(4)	X (2)		X (8)	(4)	X (4)	
Develop an Understanding of Black Exper.		X (8)	(1)	(5)	X (2)	(1)	X (7)	(3)	X (5)	
Family Estate & Financial Planning	X (8)		(3)	X (5)		(3)	X (5)	X (8)		
Houseplant Mgt. & Propagation	X (8)		(2)	X (5)	(1)	X (4)	(4)	X (5)		(3)
Interpersonal Communication	X (7)	(1)	(1)		X (7)	(2)	X (6)	X (3)	(3)	(2)
Military Institutions & Military Men		X (8)	(4)	(2)	X (2)		X (8)	(5)	X (3)	
Private Enterprise in U.S.		X (8)	(4)	(2)	X (2)		X (8)	(5)	X (3)	
Schools, Values, & Morals		X (8)	(5)	(2)	X (1)		X (8)	(4)	X (4)	
Changing Role of Women	(1)	X (7)	(1)	(6)	X (1)	(1)	X (7)	(7)	X (1)	
Wall St. & Small Investor	X (6)	(2)	X (7)	(1)			X (8)	X (8)		
Wisconsin's Weather	X (8)		(1)	X (5)	(2)	X (5)	(3)	X (7)		(1)

*The X indicates my ratings for each course. The arabic numbers in each box are the number of judges who checked that box.

Appendix B

MADISON AREA PROGRAMS

PARTICIPATION QUESTIONNAIRE - Spring 1973

I'd like to know why you're taking this course and how much control you'd like over its content, meeting times, outside readings, evaluation, and completion requirements. The following pages contain several statements. Part of them are possible reasons for your taking the course and another part are statements about your desire to control course learning activities. The questionnaire will take about *ten* minutes to complete. Thank you for your help.

Fredrick C. Humphrey

PART I

Reasons for Participation

Part I is made up of statements which may have influenced you to participate in this course. There are no "right" and "wrong" answers and you will probably find some reasons that influenced you very much and others that influenced you very little. Please read each statement carefully and circle the one number that corresponds to the amount of influence it had on you.

Here's an example.

REASON	AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE				
	Very Little 1	Little 2	Some 3	Much 4	Very Much 5
1. To get an increase in salary.	(1)	2	3	4	5
2. To meet new friends.	1	2	(3)	4	5

If the first statement influenced you "very little" then circle 1, as indicated. If statement number two influenced you "some" then circle 3, as indicated. If it influenced you "very much", then circle 5.

REMEMBER TO ANSWER EVERY STATEMENT

REASON	AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE				
	Very Little 1	Little 2	Some 3	Much 4	Very Much 5
1. To forget personal problems.	1	2	3	4	5
2. To meet people.	1	2	3	4	5
3. To have a few hours away from responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5
4. To get away from the daily routine of living.	1	2	3	4	5
5. To improve my ability to help others.	1	2	3	4	5
6. To feel a sense of belonging.	1	2	3	4	5
7. To satisfy a desire to learn something new.	1	2	3	4	5
8. To study something meaningful to me.	1	2	3	4	5
9. To increase my competence to achieve my goals.	1	2	3	4	5
10. To learn in order to secure personal advancement.	1	2	3	4	5
11. To fulfill a personal motivation to get ahead.	1	2	3	4	5
12. To maintain or improve my social position.	1	2	3	4	5
13. To become a better informed person.	1	2	3	4	5
14. To enrich my life by learning.	1	2	3	4	5
15. To take my mind off other difficulties.	1	2	3	4	5

REASON	AMOUNT OF INFLUENCE				
	Very Little 1	Little 2	Some 3	Much 4	Very Much 5
16. To become eligible for benefits I could not otherwise receive.	1	2	3	4	5
17. To plan and pursue my individual study.	1	2	3	4	5
18. To gain additional credits for my record.	1	2	3	4	5
19. To enjoy the fellowship.	1	2	3	4	5
20. To satisfy a desire to know.	1	2	3	4	5
21. To enjoy a change from my present social life.	1	2	3	4	5
22. To keep up with competition.	1	2	3	4	5
23. To seek relief from economic pressures of life.	1	2	3	4	5
24. To gain insights into myself as a person.	1	2	3	4	5
25. To satisfy an intellectual curiosity.	1	2	3	4	5
26. To feed my appetite for knowledge.	1	2	3	4	5
27. To study for its own sake.	1	2	3	4	5
28. To make social contacts.	1	2	3	4	5
29. To meet the educational requirements of our era.	1	2	3	4	5
30. To find relief from some unsatisfactory condition of life.	1	2	3	4	5

PLEASE GO ON TO PART II

PART II

Preference for Control of Learning Activities

Thinking about this course, please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each of the statements listed below. Please read each statement carefully and circle the one number that corresponds to your level of agreement or disagreement. For example, if you strongly disagree with the first statement, circle number 1; if you are uncertain, circle number 3; if you strongly agree, circle number 5. PLEASE ANSWER EVERY STATEMENT.

STATEMENT	AMOUNT OF AGREEMENT				
	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Uncertain 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
1. Meaningful learning for me is learning that I will plan myself.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I want to measure my own progress in this course.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I know what I should learn in this course.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I prefer to have the instructor evaluate my performance in this course.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I learn best when I set my own course objectives.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I prefer to decide what I should learn from this course.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The instructor should have every class session planned in advance.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I'm at my best when the instructor determines what I ought to learn.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I would like to have the right to suggest changes in course content to the instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The instructor should decide how classes will be conducted.	1	2	3	4	5

STATEMENT	AMOUNT OF AGREEMENT				
	Strongly Disagree 1	Disagree 2	Uncertain 3	Agree 4	Strongly Agree 5
11. Evaluation of course performance should be done jointly by the instructor and student.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I like to pursue ideas on my own, even during class.	1	2	3	4	5
13. I like to lead discussions during class sessions.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Learning objectives for this course should be determined jointly by student and instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
15. An unstructured course is a waste of my time.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I would like to help the instructor decide when the course meetings are held.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I would like to determine what my out-of-class assignments will be.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Course content should be determined jointly by student and instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
19. The instructor is responsible for planning course content.	1	2	3	4	5
20. The instructor should make all assignments for out-of-class readings.	1	2	3	4	5